SIGEH ELT: Journal of Literature and Linguistics
Volume 6 Number 1, March 2026, pp: 974-984
E-ISSN: 2775-8834

Assessment of the Linguistic Quality of Postgraduate Dissertations: Analysis of Textual Metafunction within the Framework of Systemic Functional Linguistics

Mantasiah R.[1], Fathullah Wajdi[2], Jufri[3]
[123]Department of Language Education, Faculty of Languages and Literature, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

Article Info

Submitted:
21 May 2025
Reviewed:
26 July 2026 – 1 September 2026
Accepted:
2 September 2026
Published:
24 September 2026

Keywords:
Textual metafunction; systemic functional linguistics; dissertation; cohesion; theme–rheme

Abstract

Postgraduate dissertations are expected to communicate complex arguments clearly; however, their assessment often prioritizes grammar and content over textual organization, cohesion, and readability. This study examined the linguistic quality of postgraduate dissertations at Makassar State University through the textual metafunction of Systemic Functional Linguistics. Using a descriptive qualitative design with a descriptive quantitative component, eight purposively selected dissertations were analyzed for grammatical cohesion, lexical cohesion, paragraph and section coherence, and Theme–Rheme organization. The dataset contained 393 coded observations, of which 392 had complete ratings. Overall, 292 observations (74.5%) were rated very good, 91 (23.2%) good, and nine (2.3%) developing; none received a poor rating. References and conjunctions occurred in 47 and 42 of 107 grammatical-cohesion observations, whereas repetition and synonymy occurred in 52 and 49 of 102 lexical-cohesion observations. Theme–Rheme organization received the highest mean rating (3.86), followed by paragraph and section coherence (3.80), grammatical cohesion (3.64), and lexical cohesion (3.62). The findings nevertheless identified ambiguous references, immediate repetition, limited substitution and ellipsis, and dense Rhemes that reduced readability. These results support explicit postgraduate writing instruction in referential clarity, lexical variation, thematic development, and the integration of cohesive resources across dissertation sections and provide an auditable basis for dissertation assessment.

Correspondence Author: Fathullah Wajdi Email: fathullah.wajdi@unm.ac.id
DOI: https://doi.org/10.36269/sigeh.v6i2.3340
Publisher: Universitas Muhammadiyah Lampung
Journal Homepage: https://journal.uml.ac.id/index.php/ELt/index
Journal SIGEH ELT licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

INTRODUCTION

Postgraduate dissertations are expected to communicate complex disciplinary knowledge through arguments that are not only substantively sound but also logically organized and accessible to readers. In practice, dissertation assessment frequently foregrounds research content, methodology, and sentence-level accuracy, while the textual resources that connect propositions, manage information flow, and guide readers through an extended argument receive less systematic attention. This is consequential because cohesion does not automatically ensure coherence: writers must select cohesive resources in ways that make semantic relations and rhetorical progression recoverable for readers (Niitemaa, 2022; Crossley et al., 2023).

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) provides a productive framework for examining this dimension of academic writing. Within SFL, the textual metafunction concerns how language

organizes experiential and interpersonal meanings into a coherent message. At clause level, Theme identifies the point of departure and Rheme develops the message; across clauses and paragraphs, thematic progression and cohesive relations help readers track continuity and change. Grammatical cohesion is commonly realized through reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction, whereas lexical cohesion is realized through repetition, synonymy, hyponymy, and collocation. Recent studies consistently show that the distribution and appropriateness of these resources affect the perceived coherence, readability, and rhetorical effectiveness of student academic texts (Susilowati et al., 2022; Alawerdy & Alalwi, 2022; Lestari & Nurlela, 2026).

Evidence from EFL and academic-writing contexts nevertheless indicates that students often rely on a narrow range of cohesive resources. Conjunctions and reference markers are frequently dominant, while substitution, ellipsis, lexical variation, and more complex thematic progression occur less consistently (Al-Mozahem & Al-Mahrooqi, 2023; Qureshi et al., 2023; Lestari & Nurlela, 2026). In particular, repetition can maintain topical continuity but may become redundant when used without lexical variation; similarly, demonstrative and personal references may create ambiguity when their antecedents are distant or compete with other possible referents. Research on thesis introductions likewise shows that an overreliance on constant thematic progression can preserve a topic but limit the development of new information and weaken paragraph-level argumentation (Ismail et al., 2024; Satriani, 2024).

Prior studies establish the value of thematic organization but remain poorly aligned with dissertation-scale evidence. Susilowati et al. (2022) analyzed only ten expert research articles, not student-authored long-form texts; the review by Sun et al. (2024) integrated 32 methodologically heterogeneous EFL studies, which constrained synthesis and supplied no primary dissertation data; and Yang et al. (2024) compared human- and AI-generated argumentative texts rather than naturally produced postgraduate writing. Instructional evidence is equally bounded: Alawerdy and Alalwi (2022) examined 43 first-year Saudi students, short paragraphs, and conjunctions alone; Zhang and Zhang (2023) studied 46 Chinese undergraduates during a seven-week intervention focused on the Engagement system and stance, not textual metafunction as a whole; and Noviarini (2025) reported a six-session qualitative case from one Indonesian senior high school, without cross-site or long-term evidence. Collectively, these studies isolate either thematic patterns or individual SFL resources in short texts and novice populations. They therefore do not explain how grammatical cohesion, lexical cohesion, and Theme-Rheme organization interact across sections of authentic Indonesian postgraduate dissertations.

Within Indonesian scholarship, however, the central problem is fragmentation by genre, educational level, and analytical scope. Susilowati et al. (2022) drew thematic evidence from only ten expert research articles, so the findings cannot represent student-authored, dissertation-length argumentation. Ismail et al. (2024) examined thesis introductions by five selected high-performing EFL students, limiting the evidence to a small, high-achieving sample and a single section. Lestari and Nurlela (2026) analyzed cohesive devices in 20 undergraduate abstracts; their compressed genre and undergraduate level preclude conclusions about cohesion across doctoral chapters. The SIGEH ELT studies are still more peripheral: Sihura and Daniela (2024) examined nominalization in media headlines rather than academic prose; Yulianto (2025) addressed classroom style variation rather than extended writing; Male et al. (2025) elicited five students' perceptions of artificial intelligence instead of analyzing their writing; Karima et al. (2025) investigated moves and multimodality in short religious invitation letters rather than academic genres; and Eryon et al. (2023) traced one adverbial form in a literary translation. Thus, the local literature is divided

between narrowly sampled academic texts and linguistically relevant but non-dissertation genres. None integrates grammatical cohesion, lexical cohesion, and Theme–Rheme organization in a section-sensitive analysis of authentic Indonesian postgraduate dissertations, leaving precisely the empirical gap addressed in this study.

Accordingly, this study investigates the linguistic quality of postgraduate dissertations at Makassar State University through the textual metafunction of SFL. It addresses the following questions (1) How are grammatical and lexical cohesive devices realized in the sampled postgraduate dissertations? (2) How are Theme–Rheme structures and thematic variation realized in the sampled dissertations? (3) What textual-metafunction strengths and recurring constraints characterize the linguistic quality of the dissertations?

The study contributes an empirically grounded profile of textual resources in Indonesian postgraduate dissertation writing. It also offers implications for SFL-informed writing instruction and for more explicit linguistic criteria in dissertation supervision and assessment.

METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive qualitative design with a descriptive quantitative component. The qualitative analysis identified and interpreted textual-metafunction resources, while the quantitative component summarized the frequencies and four-point ratings recorded in the supplied coding matrix. This design enabled the functions of linguistic choices to be examined in context and their distributions to be reported across the corpus (Susilowati et al., 2022; Ismail et al., 2024).

Corpus and Sampling

The population comprised doctoral dissertations submitted to and available in the repository of the Postgraduate Program at Makassar State University between 2020 and 2024. Eight dissertations were selected through purposive sampling. To be included, a dissertation had to: (a) be complete and publicly accessible; (b) contain clearly identifiable major sections that permitted cross-section sampling; and (c) represent more than one academic field. The coded excerpts represented multiple dissertation chapters containing sustained exposition and argumentation and therefore provided appropriate material for examining cohesion, thematic organization, and readability.

The unit of analysis was the coded excerpt, usually a clause or clause complex. The dissertations were anonymized as D1–D8. Each matrix row received a traceable compound identifier consisting of the dissertation code, analytical dimension, and within-table sequence number: GC for grammatical cohesion, LC for lexical cohesion, CO for paragraph and section coherence, and TR for Theme–Rheme organization (e.g., D1-GC05). The study evaluated textual-metafunction resources only, not disciplinary content, originality, or the overall academic merit of the dissertations.

Analytical Framework and Instrument

The analysis used an SFL-oriented coding sheet adapted from recent studies of thematic structure, thematic progression, and cohesion in student academic writing (Susilowati et al., 2022; Lestari & Nurlela, 2026; Ismail et al., 2024). The matrix covered four dimensions: (1) grammatical cohesion, including reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction; (2) lexical cohesion, including repetition, synonymy, and collocation; (3) coherence across paragraphs and sections; and (4) Theme–Rheme organization. Qualitative notes also documented referential clarity, lexical

redundancy, sentence complexity, and reader orientation. Because a row could contain more than one resource, device-frequency counts were treated as non-mutually exclusive.

Each observation was rated on a four-point analytic scale: 1 = poor, 2 = developing, 3 = good, and 4 = very good. The scale summarized the adequacy, appropriateness, and clarity of the resource in its local context; it was not treated as a measure of a writer's general language proficiency. Frequencies, percentages, and means were calculated from nonmissing ratings only, and no score was imputed.

Data Collection and Analysis and Ethical Considerations

Data collection and analysis were conducted from January to April 2025. First, the selected sections were extracted and segmented into analyzable excerpts. Second, the excerpts were coded for the four dimensions and assessed using the analytic scale. Third, compound source identifiers were assigned and the matrix was checked for repeated header rows and missing ratings. The final matrix contained 393 coded observations: 107 grammatical-cohesion observations, 102 lexical-cohesion observations, 92 coherence observations, and 92 Theme–Rheme observations. Of these, 392 had complete ratings; D8-CO06 had no recorded score and was retained as qualitative evidence but excluded from rating distributions and means. Finally, descriptive statistics were compiled overall, by dimension, and by dissertation, and representative excerpts were selected using their source identifiers.

Two linguists independently reviewed the coding sheet and a subset of the data. Disagreements were discussed until consensus was reached, and the agreed coding principles were applied to the remaining data. Trustworthiness was strengthened through source triangulation across dissertations, peer debriefing, and preservation of an audit trail containing the coding sheet, excerpt identifiers, and rating decisions. The study used publicly accessible institutional documents. No personal data were reported. Dissertation titles, authors' names, and other identifying information were removed from the data excerpts.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

Data Coverage and Rating Distribution

The coding matrix contained 393 observations from D1–D8. One coherence observation (D8-CO06) lacked a recorded rating, leaving 392 observations for the score distribution. Overall, 292 observations (74.5%) received score 4, 91 (23.2%) score 3, and nine (2.3%) score 2; none received score 1. The overall mean was 3.72. Table 1 presents the complete distribution by analytical dimension.

Table 1. Rating Distribution by Analytical Dimension

Dimension	Rated n	Score 1 n (%)	Score 2 n (%)	Score 3 n (%)	Score 4 n (%)	Mean
Grammatical cohesion	107	0 (0.0)	2 (1.9)	35 (32.7)	70 (65.4)	3.64
Lexical cohesion	102	0 (0.0)	6 (5.9)	27 (26.5)	69 (67.6)	3.62
Paragraph/section coherence	91*	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	16 (17.6)	74 (81.3)	3.80
Theme–Rheme organization	92	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	13 (14.1)	79 (85.9)	3.86
Overall	**392**	**0 (0.0)**	**9 (2.3)**	**91 (23.2)**	**292 (74.5)**	**3.72**

Across the 392 rated observations, the findings indicate consistently strong performance across all four dimensions, with 292 observations (74.5%) receiving Score 4 and 91 (23.2%) receiving Score 3, while only nine (2.3%) were rated Score 2 and none received Score 1. Theme–Rheme organization achieved the highest mean score (3.86), with 85.9% of its observations rated Score 4, followed by paragraph and section coherence (M = 3.80; 81.3% Score 4). Grammatical cohesion (M = 3.64) and lexical cohesion (M = 3.62) also demonstrated favorable distributions, although they contained more Score 2 and Score 3 observations. Overall, the mean score of 3.72 shows that the analyzed dissertations generally demonstrated effective textual organization and cohesion, while the small proportion of lower ratings identifies specific aspects requiring further improvement.

Table 2. Frequency of Coded Grammatical and Lexical Resources

Dimension	Coded resource	N	% of dimension observations
Grammatical cohesion (n = 107)	Reference	47	43.9
	Conjunction	42	39.3
	Ellipsis	21	19.6
	Substitution	20	18.7
Lexical cohesion (n = 102)	Repetition	52	51.0
	Synonymy	49	48.0
	Collocation	**13**	**12.7**

The distribution of coded cohesive resources shows that reference was the most frequently identified grammatical-cohesion device, occurring in 47 of 107 observations (43.9%), followed by conjunction in 42 observations (39.3%), ellipsis in 21 (19.6%), and substitution in 20 (18.7%). Within the 102 lexical-cohesion observations, repetition was slightly more frequent than synonymy, occurring in 52 (51.0%) and 49 observations (48.0%), respectively, whereas collocation appeared considerably less often in 13 observations (12.7%). These findings indicate that grammatical continuity was primarily established through reference and conjunction, while lexical continuity relied almost equally on repetition and synonymy. Because an observation could contain more than one cohesive resource, the categories are not mutually exclusive and their percentages should not be summed.

Table 3. Rated Observations and Mean Score by Dissertation Source

Source	GC n	LC n	CO n	TR n	Total rated n	Mean
D1	14	14	10	10	48	3.60
D2	14	12	9	10	45	3.73
D3	13	14	12	11	50	3.48
D4	14	10	10	10	44	3.68
D5	20	20	20	20	80	3.74
D6	20	20	20	20	80	3.95
D7	6	5	5	5	21	3.71
D8	6	7	5*	6	24	3.71
Overall	107	102	91	92	392	3.72

Across the eight dissertation sources, 392 observations were rated, comprising 107 grammatical-cohesion (GC), 102 lexical-cohesion (LC), 91 coherence (CO), and 92 Theme–Rheme

(TR) observations, with an overall mean of 3.72. D5 and D6 provided the largest and most evenly distributed evidence bases, each contributing 80 observations, or 20 observations per dimension, whereas D7 contributed the fewest observations (n = 21). Source-level mean scores ranged from 3.48 for D3 to 3.95 for D6, while the remaining sources recorded means between 3.60 and 3.74, indicating generally favorable but nonuniform ratings across the dissertations. The D8 coherence count includes only five rated observations because one additional coded coherence observation lacked a recorded score and was excluded from the quantitative calculation.

Grammatical Cohesion

Among the 107 grammatical-cohesion observations, references were coded in 47 (43.9%) and conjunctions in 42 (39.3%), compared with ellipsis in 21 (19.6%) and substitution in 20 (18.7%). Because combined categories were permitted, these percentages are not mutually exclusive (Table 2). The rating distribution comprised 70 very good observations (65.4%), 35 good observations (32.7%), and two developing observations (1.9%), producing a mean of 3.64 (Table 1). Thus, reference and conjunction were more frequently represented in the coded matrix, while the data do not establish normalized rates for the full dissertation texts.

Reference quality varied despite its relatively high coded frequency. The pronoun “ia” in “Penelitian ini dilakukan karena data mendukung hipotesis; ia menunjukkan tren yang stabil” had more than one plausible antecedent and received a good rather than very good rating (D1-GC05, score 3). By contrast, the demonstrative in “Paradigma ini lebih menekankan pada pembentukan kebiasaan belajar” maintained an accessible referent (D2-GC14, score 4). The two developing grammatical-cohesion observations documented minimal substitution and the near absence of ellipsis in D7 (D7-GC05 and D7-GC06, score 2).

Where substitution and ellipsis were present, they could support economy without obscuring meaning. For example, “Metode utama adalah kualitatif; metode sekunder, kuantitatif” retained an interpretable parallel relation through ellipsis and received a very good rating (D3-GC06, score 4). No grammatical-cohesion observation received a poor rating.

Lexical Cohesion

Among the 102 lexical-cohesion observations, repetition was coded in 52 (51.0%), synonymy in 49 (48.0%), and collocation in 13 (12.7%); multiple labels were permitted (Table 2). Ratings comprised 69 very good observations (67.6%), 27 good observations (26.5%), and six developing observations (5.9%), with a mean of 3.62 (Table 1). Repetition was therefore only slightly more frequent than synonymy in the coded observations, rather than overwhelmingly dominant.

The lexical records show how variation maintained reference within a stable conceptual field. For example, “guru–pendidik” and “peserta didik–siswa” were coded as synonymy and received very good ratings (D6-LC02 and D6-LC03, score 4). These traceable observations support the interpretation that writers could vary terminology without abandoning disciplinary continuity.

Collocation occurred in 13 lexical observations. The pairing “kinerja akademik dan prestasi belajar” was rated very good because it was conventional within educational discourse (D1-LC06, score 4). In contrast, immediate repetition in “Penelitian ini menyatakan bahwa hasil penelitian memberikan gambaran” was coded as developing because the repeated item added no new rhetorical function (D1-LC12, score 2).

Coherence Across Paragraphs and Sections

The coherence dimension contained 92 observations, of which 91 had ratings. Among the rated observations, 74 (81.3%) were very good, 16 (17.6%) were good, and one (1.1%) was

developing; the mean was 3.80 (Table 1). The prospective signal “Setelah analisis ini, bagian selanjutnya akan membahas...” explicitly forecast the next section (D3-CO03, score 4), whereas “Seperti yang dibahas dalam bagian sebelumnya...” provided a less fully specified retrospective link (D3-CO05, score 3).

The only developing coherence observation identified theory subsections that ended without a bridge to the following subsection (D5-CO09, score 2). This source-specific evidence supports the claim that abrupt movement occurred, but it does not imply that such movement characterized every dissertation. One additional coherence observation, D8-CO06, lacked a recorded score and was excluded from the quantitative distribution.

Theme–Rheme Organization

All 92 Theme–Rheme observations had complete ratings: 79 (85.9%) were very good and 13 (14.1%) were good, yielding the highest dimensional mean (3.86). The clause “Paradigma behaviorisme lebih menekankan pada stimulus-respons...” presented a readily identifiable Theme and a focused Rheme (D2-TR01, score 4). By comparison, “Dalam penelitian ini ditemukan bahwa reviu terhadap pengelolaan dana pendidikan masih lemah” was functional but less developed and received a good rating (D4-TR05, score 3).

The source tables recorded Theme and Rheme spans and their quality ratings, but they did not include a separate exhaustive frequency field for marked, unmarked, textual, or multiple Themes. Accordingly, the present results support a claim about the observed clarity of Theme–Rheme organization, not a prevalence claim for particular thematic subtypes.

Readability and Sentence Complexity

Readability was documented in the qualitative notes rather than as a separate frequency dimension. The Rheme in “Konsep kebebasan berpikir sebagai bentuk pembebasan intelektual melalui ide dan gagasan yang dituangkan dalam tulisan...” was judged overly extended and received a good rating rather than very good (D1-TR10, score 3). This observation illustrates how information density can reduce immediate readability without constituting a grammatical error.

The coding comments likewise indicated that punctuation and internal transitions improved readability when they made relations among propositions explicit. Because readability did not have a standalone frequency column, this result is reported as a qualitative interpretation tied to identified excerpts rather than as a corpus-wide rate.

Integrative Cohesion and Reader Orientation

Cross-coding provided traceable evidence of resource integration. The “Paradigma behaviorisme...” excerpt was separately coded for conjunction and reference (D2-GC01), lexical repetition (D2-LC01), and Theme–Rheme organization (D2-TR01); each observation received a very good rating. This convergence shows how grammatical, lexical, and thematic resources can jointly orient the reader.

Integration was not uniform. The ambiguous reference in D1-GC05 and the redundant repetition in D1-LC12 show that the presence of a cohesive device did not guarantee rhetorical effectiveness. Across all 392 rated observations, however, 383 (97.7%) were good or very good and nine (2.3%) were developing; no observation received a poor rating.

Discussion

The descriptive results indicate generally strong but not uniform control of textual-metafunction resources. Of 392 rated observations, 292 (74.5%) were very good, 91 (23.2%) were good, and nine (2.3%) were developing. The range of source-level means, from 3.48 for D3 to 3.95

for D6 (Table 3), further shows that an overall favorable distribution should not be interpreted as equal performance across dissertations.

First, the grammatical-cohesion counts refine the interpretation of prominence: references appeared in 47 of 107 observations and conjunctions in 42, whereas substitution and ellipsis appeared in 20 and 21, respectively. This pattern is consistent with studies reporting frequent reference and conjunction in student academic writing (Lestari & Nurlela, 2026; Al-Mozahem & Al-Mahrooqi, 2023; Qureshi et al., 2023). The present data add a postgraduate-dissertation perspective, while D1-GC05 demonstrates that frequency must be distinguished from effectiveness: a pronoun contributes to cohesion only when its antecedent is recoverable without unnecessary processing.

Second, repetition was coded in 52 of 102 lexical observations and synonymy in 49, a difference of only three observations. The result therefore indicates a near balance between continuity through recurrence and variation through related forms, not an overwhelming dependence on repetition. The six developing lexical observations nevertheless show that immediate recurrence without a new rhetorical function can produce redundancy, as in D1-LC12. This interpretation accords with the view that lexical cohesion supports academic quality when it operates at local, global, and genre-sensitive levels (Crossley et al., 2023; Niitemaa, 2022).

Third, Theme–Rheme organization was the highest-rated dimension, with 79 of 92 observations rated very good and 13 rated good. This distribution supports an interpretation of generally clear points of departure and message development in the sampled excerpts. However, because the source matrix did not contain mutually exclusive frequency codes for marked, unmarked, textual, and multiple Themes, the evidence does not permit a statistically grounded prevalence comparison among those subtypes.

The evidence instead supports a more limited pedagogical interpretation: clear Theme–Rheme organization can coexist with locally dense Rhemes, as illustrated by D1-TR10. Dissertation writers should therefore learn to maintain a recognizable point of departure while distributing new information across manageable clause complexes. Future coding should separately quantify constant, linear, split-Rheme, and derived-Theme patterns before comparative prevalence claims are made (Susilowati et al., 2022; Sun et al., 2024).

Fourth, the coherence ratings were also favorable—74 of 91 rated observations were very good—yet the developing case D5-CO09 shows why local grammatical correctness is insufficient for reader-oriented academic writing. A section may contain individually cohesive sentences but remain difficult to follow when a subsection closes without a prospective bridge. The results therefore support an assessment approach that evaluates cohesive devices in relation to their rhetorical function rather than merely counting their presence.

The cross-coded D2 example (D2-GC01, D2-LC01, and D2-TR01) provides empirical support for an integrated view of textual control: reference, conjunction, lexical recurrence, and thematic choice worked together and each received a very good rating. This supports research arguing that cohesion is register- and genre-sensitive (Crossley et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2025). For postgraduate programs, writing support should therefore move beyond lists of connectives to guided analysis of referential clarity, lexical continuity, thematic movement, and paragraph transitions.

The study makes three contributions. Empirically, it documents both strengths and constraints in the textual metafunction of Indonesian postgraduate dissertations. Analytically, it combines grammatical cohesion, lexical cohesion, Theme–Rheme organization, readability, and reader orientation rather than treating these features as unrelated skills. Pedagogically, it provides a

basis for an SFL-informed rubric that supervisors and examiners can use to discuss textual quality with greater specificity. Such a rubric should include not only the presence of cohesive devices but also antecedent clarity, appropriateness of logical relations, lexical precision, thematic development, paragraph transitions, and readability.

CONCLUSION

This study examined 393 coded observations from eight postgraduate dissertations at Makassar State University; 392 observations had complete ratings. Overall, 292 observations (74.5%) were very good, 91 (23.2%) were good, and nine (2.3%) were developing, with no poor ratings. References and conjunctions were identified in 47 and 42 of 107 grammatical-cohesion observations, while repetition and synonymy were identified in 52 and 49 of 102 lexical-cohesion observations. Theme–Rheme organization had the highest mean rating (3.86), followed by coherence across paragraphs and sections (3.80), grammatical cohesion (3.64), and lexical cohesion (3.62). The traceable constraints included ambiguous reference (D1-GC05), redundant repetition (D1-LC12), an abrupt subsection transition (D5-CO09), and an overly dense Rheme (D1-TR10).

The study's main contribution is an SFL-based profile that distinguishes the availability of cohesive resources from their rhetorical effectiveness in extended postgraduate writing. The findings support the integration of explicit instruction on thematic progression, referential clarity, paraphrasing, lexical selection, and integrated cohesion into postgraduate academic-writing courses and dissertation supervision. They also support the development of SFL-informed linguistic criteria for dissertation assessment.

This study is limited by its small purposive corpus of eight dissertations and by the excerpt-based coding matrix, which supports frequencies of coded observations but not corpus-wide or normalized token frequencies. The matrix did not separately quantify thematic subtypes, and one coherence observation (D8-CO06) lacked a rating. Future research should analyze a larger cross-disciplinary corpus, report raw and normalized frequencies, code thematic-progression subtypes as mutually exclusive categories, compare dissertation quality bands, and examine ideational and interpersonal metafunctions alongside textual metafunction.

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge Universitas Negeri Makassar for its invaluable institutional support and resources. They also thank their colleagues and academic mentors for the constructive feedback provided throughout the development of this research and the anonymous reviewers for their insightful suggestions, which substantially improved the quality of the manuscript.

Credit Authorship Contribution Statement

Mantasiah R.: Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Supervision, and Writing – Review & Editing. **Fathullah Wajdi**: Conceptualization, Investigation, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Visualization, Writing – Original Draft, and Project Administration. **Jufri**: Methodology, Validation, Supervision, and Writing – Review & Editing. All authors reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript and agreed to be accountable for the integrity of the work.

Funding

This research was funded by Universitas Negeri Makassar through the Non-Tax State Revenue (PNBP) funding scheme.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Use of Artificial Intelligence

The authors used DeepL Translator to assist with language translation, ChatGPT to support the data-coding process, and Mendeley to organize citations and references. All AI-assisted outputs were critically reviewed, verified, and revised by the authors. The authors retained full responsibility for the data analysis, interpretation, conclusions, and final content of the manuscript.

REFERENCE

Alawerdy, A. S., & Alalwi, F. S. (2022). Enhancing English as a foreign language university students' writing through explicit instruction of conjunctions as cohesive devices: An experimental study. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 1053310. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1053310

Al-Mozahem, A., & Al-Mahrooqi, R. (2023). These students can't write: An examination of cohesion and coherence in essays written by the University of Botswana ESL undergraduate students. International Journal of Higher Education, 12(3), 52–64. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v12n3p52

Crossley, S. A., et al. (2023). Exploring new insights into the role of cohesive devices in written academic genres. Assessing Writing, 57, 100749. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100749

Eryon, E., Maretha, C., Alrajafi, G., & Puspita, R. (2023). The translation shift of translating adverb manner with suffix –ly from English as the source language into Indonesian as the target language (Case study of translating novel "Pit Pendulum" by Edgar Allan Poe into "Jurang dan Pendulum" by Maggie Tiojakin). *SIGEH ELT: Journal of Literature and Linguistics, 3*(2), 98–116. https://doi.org/10.36269/sigeh.v3i2.2068

Hong, X., Niu, R., & Zheng, Y. (2026). Cohesive strategies in student academic writing: How register functions are realized across disciplines and genres. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2025-0258

Chen, M., & Cui, Y. (2022). The effects of AWE and peer feedback on cohesion and coherence in continuation writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 57*, Article 100915. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2022.100915

Ismail, A., Anwar, I. W., Sailuddin, S. P., & Ismail, H. (2024). Evaluating cohesion and coherence in thesis introductions: A thematic progression analysis of EFL students' texts. Indonesian Journal of Learning and Instruction, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.25134/ijli.v7i1.9594

Karima, A., Saragih, F. D. C., Priyatama, M. R., Simorangkir, N. S., & Zein, T. T. (2025). A genre-based discourse analysis: Christmas invitation letter in GKPS Indonesia. *SIGEH ELT: Journal of Literature and Linguistics, 5*(1), 547–557. https://doi.org/10.36269/sigeh.v5i1.2968

Lestari, D. P., & Nurlela. (2026). A case study of cohesion in academic texts through systemic functional linguistics. JALL: Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literacy, 10(1), 94–104. https://doi.org/10.25157/jall.v10i1.22946

Male, H., Timu, T. M., & Sabrina, D. (2025). The role of artificial intelligence (AI) in essay writing. *SIGEH ELT: Journal of Literature and Linguistics, 5*(1), 476–493. https://doi.org/10.36269/sigeh.v5i1.3115

Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2008). *Genre relations: Mapping culture*. Equinox.

Niitemaa, M.-L. (2022). Cohesion in upper-secondary EFL student essays: The role of online resources and lexical knowledge. EduLingua, 8(1). https://doi.org/10.14232/edulingua.2022.1.1

Noviarini, T. (2025). Role of Theme-Rheme analysis in developing academic literacy skills in senior high school students in Pringsewu. ELT-Lectura, 12(1), 51–61. https://doi.org/10.31849/elt-lectura.v12i1.20305

Qureshi, S., et al. (2023). A study of cohesive devices in students' academic writing. Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 4(4). https://doi.org/10.55737/qjssh.897009451

Satriani, I. (2024). Exploring undergraduate students' thesis abstracts: A discourse analysis of thematic progression. *ELT in Focus*, *7*(1), 60–67. https://doi.org/10.35706/eltinfc.v7i1.11236

Sihura, A. A., & Daniela, L. (2024). The effects of nominalization in NBCUniversal: A discourse analysis in Coronation 2023. *SIGEH ELT: Journal of Literature and Linguistics*, *4*(2), 253–272. https://doi.org/10.36269/sigeh.v4i2.2574 .

Staples, S., Gray, B., Biber, D., & Egbert, J. (2023). Writing trajectories of grammatical complexity at the university: Comparing L1 and L2 English writers in BAWE. *Applied Linguistics*, *44*(1), 46–71. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amac047

Sun, Y., et al. (2024). Investigating the application of thematic progression in EFL writing: A systematic review. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 23(2). https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.2.14

Susilowati, E., Faridi, A., & Sakhiyya, Z. (2022). Thematic structure and thematic progression in research articles published in Scopus-indexed international journals. English Education Journal, 12(1), 55–66. https://doi.org/10.15294/eej.v12i1.53229

Yang, S., Chen, S., Zhu, H., Lin, J., & Wang, X. (2024). A comparative study of thematic choices and thematic progression patterns in human-written and AI-generated texts. System, 126, 103494. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103494

Yulianto, A. (2025). Language in context: Exploring style variation in the class of English for journalism. SIGEH ELT: Journal of Literature and Linguistics, 5(1), 494–511. https://doi.org/10.36269/sigeh.v5i1.3100

Zhang, L. J., & Zhang, D. (2023). Improving EFL students' stance-taking in academic writing with SFL-based instruction: A qualitative inquiry. Language Teaching Research. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688231164758